Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 02 1529 MAR 10 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

BRIAN PERRYMAN, District Director,
and the
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondents.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TAHER KAMELI, ESQ.
LAW OFFICES OF KAMELI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
220 South State Street
Suite 2026
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-4529
Attorney of Record for Petitioner

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals was correct in affirming the District Court's Order dismissing the Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment, and Injunction, thereby circumventing the constitutionality of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5).

2. Whether the District Court's denial of the Petition For Leave To File First Amended Complaint adding a Habeas Corpus claim was properly affirmed by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

3. Whether the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals' assessment that 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) and the prior removal reinstatement procedure does not deny Petitioner due process of law and does not violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution was correct and whether such a determination is inconsistent with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' position on the same issue.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Including the parties named in the caption of this Petition, the parties are:

Petitioner: Ruben Gomez-Chavez, an individual.

Respondents: Brian Perryman, District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and

Immigration and Naturalization Service, a governmental division of the United States Department of Justice (known as the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services as of March 1, 2003).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented	i
Parties To The Proceedings	ii
Table Of Contents	iii
Table Of Authorities	iv
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	3
Citations Of Relevant Provisions, Statutes, And Regulations	3
Statement Of The Case	4
Reasons For Granting The Writ	8
Conclusion	21
Appendix	
Circuit Court Opinion	1a
Circuit Court Judgment	12a
Circuit Court Order Amending The Opinion	14a
Notice Of Intent/Decision To Reinstate Prior Order	16a
Notice Of Order Of Expedited Removal	19a
District Court Order Dismissing Case For Lack Of Jurisdiction	21a
Circuit Court Order Denying Petition For Rehearing	22a
Text Of Relevant Provisions, Statutes, And Regulations	23a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Alvarenga-Villalobos v. Ashcroft, 271 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 2001) 19, 20

Bowen v. Michigan Acad. of Family Physicians, 476 U.S. 667 (1986) 8

Bridges v. Wixon, 326 U.S. 135 (1945) 13, 14

Bugajewitz v. Adams, 228 U.S. 585 (1913) 13

Carafas v. LaVallee, 391 U.S. 234 (1968) 10, 11

Castillo-Villagra v. INS, 972 F.2d 1017 (9th Cir. 1992) 18

Castro-Cortez v. INS, 239 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 2001) 18, 19, 20

Chinese Exclusion Case, The, 130 U.S. 581 (1889) 13

Chong v. INS, 264 F.3d 378 (3rd Cir. 2001) 10

Getachew v. INS, 25 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 1994) 18

INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) 13

INS v. St. Cyr, 533 U.S. 289 (2001) 8

Johannessen v. U.S., 225 U.S. 227 (1912) 13

Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding, 344 U.S. 590 (1953) 12

Landon v. Plasencia, 459 U.S. 21 (1982) 18

Mahler v. Eby, 264 U.S. 32 (1924) 13

Mathews v. Diaz, 426 U.S. 67 (1976) 12

Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) 18

McNary v. Haitian Refugee Ctr., 498 U.S. 479 (1991) 8

Ng Fung Ho v. White, 259 U.S. 276 (1922) 13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982) 12

Reno v. A.A.D.C., 525 U.S. 471 (1999) 8

Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993) 12, 17, 18

Shaughnessy v. U.S. ex rel. Mezei, 345 U.S. 206 (1953) 13

Smith v. Ashcroft, 295 F.3d 425 (4th Cir. 2002) 10, 11

Superintendent, Mass. Correctional Inst. At Walpole v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445 (1985) 12

Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath, 339 U.S. 33 (1950) 14, 15, 17, 18

Yamataya v. Fisher, 189 U.S. 86 (1903) 15, 16, 18

Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) 12

Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678 (2001) 12, 13, 17, 18

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Fifth Amendment To The United States Constitution 3, 12, 16

Fourteenth Amendment To The United States Constitution 16

STATUTES

8 U.S.C. § 155(a) 15

8 U.S.C. § 137 ..... 13, 14

8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) 3, 4

8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) 4, 9, 10, 11, 19

8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) 2, 4, 6, 8, 9

26 Stat. at L. 1085 16

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 3

28 U.S.C. § 1291 3

28 U.S.C. § 1331 ..... 4, 8, 10

28 U.S.C. § 1361 ..... 4, 8

28 U.S.C. § 2241 11

28 U.S.C. § 2254 11

CONGRESSIONAL ACTS

Immigration and Nationality Act § 241(a)(5) 4

Immigration and Nationality Act § 242(a)(1) 19

Immigration and Nationality Act § 242(b)(4) 19

REGULATIONS

8 C.F.R. § 241.8 ..... 1, 4, 5

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ, Petitioner, by undersigned counsel, under appropriate rules of this Court, requests that this Honorable Court issue a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14.1(d), the citation of the official report of the opinion below is: *Gomez-Chavez v. Perryman*, 308 F.3d 796 (7th Cir. 2002).

This is an immigration case that began to take life nearly four years ago when the Petitioner was expeditiously removed from the United States following an attempt to enter the United States with the use of false documents. After reentering the United States and marrying a United States citizen, Petitioner filed a form I-130 (petition to classify status of alien as an immediate family member of a United States citizen) and a form I-485 (petition to adjust status to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence). At an Immigration and Naturalization Service (hereinafter "INS") interview for the foregoing applications, Petitioner was found to have entered the country illegally, and a Reinstatement Order of a prior Removal Order was decreed on the Petitioner. Petitioner was arrested and detained on that day, July 18, 2001. Fortunately, Petitioner was released the following day and ordered to report back to the INS on August 2, 2001, for removal without a hearing pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 241.8.

At this point, Petitioner filed, *inter alia*, a Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment, and Injunction

with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on July 25, 2001. The Honorable Judge Conlon of the Northern District of Illinois dismissed the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on August 8, 2001, indicating that jurisdiction may lie with the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The Petitioner then filed a Petition for Review with the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; unfortunately, that court also dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, basing such a decision on the dictates of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). Subsequently, on August 9, 2001, Petitioner filed a Petition for Leave to File a First Amended Complaint adding a Habeas Corpus claim and a Motion to Reconsider in the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Both requests, however, were denied on August 21, 2001 and September 7, 2001, respectively.

On September 17, 2001, Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal and a Petition for Review from the decision of the district court dismissing the Petitioner's complaint for lack of jurisdiction and denial of amendment of complaint. The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit recalled the mandate in the prior order (Case No. 01-3068, dismissing for lack of jurisdiction in the court of appeals on the basis of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)) and on the merits declined to disturb the INS order reinstating the prior removal order. In addition, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's order (Case No. 01-3454) dismissing the complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment and Injunction. Finally, on November 25, 2002, Petitioner filed with the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals a Petition for Rehearing of the entry of judgment dated October 24, 2002. The Court

summarily denied the Petition for Rehearing on December 11, 2002.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(e)(i), the date the judgment or order sought to be reviewed was entered on October 24, 2002 by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Furthermore, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(e)(ii), a Petition for Rehearing was denied on December 11, 2002.

Moreover, according to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(e)(iv), the statutory provision believed to confer on this Court jurisdiction to review on a writ of certiorari the judgment or order in question is 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

CITATIONS OF RELEVANT PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND REGULATIONS

I. The relevant constitutional provisions involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

II. The relevant statutes involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i);

8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5);

8 U.S.C. § 1252(g);

28 U.S.C. § 1331; and

28 U.S.C. § 1361.

III. The relevant regulations involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

8 C.F.R. § 241.8(a), (b), and (c).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an immigration case which raises novel issues concerning the application of the reinstatement provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act (hereinafter "INA") § 241(a)(5), 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5), as amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Pub.L. 104-208, Div. C, 110 Stat. 3009-546 (hereinafter "IIRIRA") to Petitioner. On or about January 30, 1999, Petitioner, a Mexican National, was found inadmissible and detained by an Immigration Officer in Dallas, Texas, and was ordered removed from the United States pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). (R1 at 2). Accordingly, that section of the United States Code permits immigration officers to order aliens removed without further hearings or review unless the alien indicates an intention to apply for asylum. (R1 at 2). *See also* (App. 23a). Neither an attorney nor translator was present with Petitioner at the time of the expedited removal proceedings in the presence of the Immigration Officer on January 30, 1999. (R1 at 2). Petitioner was deported that very same day without ever receiving an administrative or judicial hearing. (R1 at 2). Shortly after deportation, Petitioner reentered the United

States without inspection, and on March 5, 1999, married a United States citizen, Sonia Martinez, in the State of Illinois. (R1 at 2). Approximately, two months following the marriage, Martinez filed with the INS a form I-130 petition (incorrectly designated as "I-30" in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals' decision, *see* App. 3a) to classify the status of the Petitioner as an immediate family member of a United States citizen. Simultaneously, the Petitioner and his U.S. citizen spouse filed with the INS a form I-485 application along with other forms to adjust Petitioner's status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence. (R1 at 2).

On June 1, 1999, the INS issued an "Employment Authorization Card" to Petitioner, and subsequently renewed said card on April 20, 2000, and April 5, 2001, respectively. (R1 at 3). Petitioner and his citizen spouse attended an interview held at the Chicago, Illinois INS office on July 18, 2001, and said interview was conducted by one of the Respondents' agents. (R1 at 3). At this point, the INS agent arrested the Petitioner based on the illegal reentry, which resulted in immediate reinstatement of his prior Removal Order of January 30, 1999. The INS agent did not send the Petitioner to an immigration judge or any other neutral body, and decided to deport him without judicial review. (R1 at 3).

On July 19, 2001, Petitioner was released from INS custody, and was ordered to report back to the INS on August 2, 2001, for removal without a hearing pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 241.8. Although Petitioner was not a convicted criminal, he was placed in INS custody for more than eighty days. (R3 at 5).

On July 25, 2001, Petitioner filed an I-212 application with Respondents for permission to reapply for admission into the United States after removal. (R3 at 5). The very same day, Petitioner filed a Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment and Injunction in the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 01 C 5768. (R1). On August 8, 2001, the district court dismissed the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, indicating that all challenges to removals belong in the court of appeals upon a timely petition for review. (R6). *See also* (App. 5a). Immediately following the dismissal, Petitioner filed a petition for review from the district court's decision in the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, which was assigned Case No. 01-3068. *See generally* (App. 4a).

On August 9, 2001, the court of appeals dismissed the petition for lack of jurisdiction, and later clarified that decision by stating that the INS's decision of July 18, 2001 "constitute[d] a decision of the Attorney General to execute a removal order and therefore this court's jurisdiction [wa]s barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)." *See generally* (App. 4a). Having no venue to entertain his constitutional claims, on August 14, 2001, Petitioner returned to the district court, asking it to reconsider its decision in light of the court of appeals' ruling. *Id.* On August 21, 2001, the district court denied his motion to reconsider (R10) and on September 7, 2001, it denied his motion for leave to file a first amended complaint (which added a claim of Habeas Corpus) (R12).

Frustrated with the seemingly closed doors of justice, Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal and Petition for Review from the decisions of the district court dismissing the Petitioner's complaint for lack of jurisdiction and denying him a right to amend his complaint. (R13). On October 24,

2002, the court of appeals recalled the mandate in the prior order (Case No. 01-3068) and on the merits declined to disturb the INS order reinstating the removal order. (App. 11a). Also, the court of appeals summarily affirmed the district court's order dismissing the Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment and Injunction (Case No. 01-3453). *Id.* In its decision, the court of appeals agreed that Petitioner's challenge to the INS's July 19, 2001 removal order was jurisdictionally correct in the court of appeals, but it concluded that "nothing he [the Petitioner] ha[d] presented entitle[d] him to relief from the INS order." (App. 6a). In denying Petitioner his request, the court, in its determination of the constitutionality of the reinstatement procedure, noted that the Petitioner "can have no liberty interest in remaining in violation of applicable United States law." (App. 8a). The Court of Appeals amended the Order of October 24, 2002 by slightly altering descriptions of the case. (App. 14a-15a).

Finally, on November 25, 2002, Petitioner filed a Petition for Rehearing of the entry of judgment dated October 24, 2002; however, this petition was denied on December 11, 2002. (App. 22a).

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

I. NEITHER THE COURT OF APPEALS, NOR THE DISTRICT COURT ENTERTAINED PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONALITY CLAIM AGAINST 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5)

A. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals Was Incorrect in Affirming the District Court's Dismissal of Petitioner's Complaint for Writ of Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment, and Injunction for Lack of Jurisdiction

First and foremost, "[t]he district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Moreover, statutory restrictions on jurisdiction are construed narrowly, and courts will not assume that jurisdiction has been repealed unless the statute says so explicitly. *McNary v. Haitian Refugee Ctr.*, 498 U.S. 479, 496, 111 S.Ct. 888, 112 L.Ed.2d 1005 (1991); *see also*, *Bowen v. Michigan Acad. of Family Physicians*, 476 U.S. 667, 670-72, 106 S.Ct. 2133, 90 L.Ed.2d 623 (1986).

According to 28 U.S.C. § 1361, the "district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff." 28 U.S.C. § 1361. Section 1252(g) of Title 8 of the United States Code may deprive federal jurisdiction over certain removal actions, but this section does not strip the courts of jurisdiction over actions involving the adjudication of applications filed by immigrants. *See generally*, *INS v. St. Cyr*, 533 U.S. 289, 121 S.Ct. 2271 (2001) and *Reno v. A.A.D.C.*, 525 U.S. 471, 119 S.Ct. 936, 142 L.Ed.2d 940 (1999).

As a preliminary matter, Petitioner Ruben Gomez-Chavez does not challenge that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) bars courts from reviewing discretionary decisions to "commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders." (App. 24a). Furthermore, Petitioner agrees that he is an "alien attempting to achieve judicial review" of the Attorney General's discretionary decision, as contemplated by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). (App. 6a). However, Petitioner was also attempting to exercise his due process rights (explained *infra* Section IB) by searching for a venue to hear his constitutional claim on the validity of his removal without a full and fair hearing *and* the constitutionality of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5). Therefore, in stark opposition to the court of appeals' categorization of Petitioner's cause of action, Petitioner is not "[a]n alien attempting to achieve judicial review of such discretionary measures" who is "avoid[ing] the § 1252(g) bar by the simple expedient of recharacterizing a claim as one challenging a refusal to act." (App. 6a).

Petitioner was not only attempting to force the Attorney General to adjudicate his INS form I-212 (the mandamus count), he was also attempting to challenge the constitutionality of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) (the declaratory judgment count) and to receive an injunction. (R1). The entire complaint was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, and subsequently affirmed by the court of appeals, which noted that Petitioner could not avoid § 1252(g)'s jurisdictional bar by recharacterizing a claim as a request for writ of mandamus. (App. 6a). However, that was merely one portion of the complaint; Petitioner's constitutionality claim of § 1231(a)(5) was ignored. The court of appeals thus affirmed the district court's ruling that his entire complaint was barred by § 1252(g). (App. 13a). Although the court of appeals entertained Petitioner's claim of the

constitutionality of his removal without a full and fair hearing (*see infra*, Section II), and merely limited this due process analysis to the reinstatement procedure itself, it nonetheless summarily affirmed the district court's dismissal of the complaint which included the *constitutionality of § 1231(a)(5)*. As noted *supra*, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, the district court had jurisdiction to hear, at minimum, the portion of Petitioner's complaint regarding the constitutionality of § 1231(a)(5) since such an action arose under a law of the United States. It follows then that the court of appeals was incorrect in affirming the district court's dismissal of Petitioner's Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment, and Injunction for lack of jurisdiction.

B. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals Was Incorrect in Affirming the District Court's Dismissal Which Included the Petition For Leave To File First Amended Complaint Adding a Habeas Corpus Claim

In order to avoid a jurisdictional challenge of the "in custody" requirements of the habeas statute, a petitioner need only be "in custody" at the time the petition was filed. *Smith v. Ashcroft*, 295 F.3d 425, 428 (4th Cir. 2002) (*citing Chong v. INS*, 264 F.3d 378, 382-83 (3d Cir. 2001) and *Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. 234, 238, 88 S.Ct. 1556, 20 L.Ed.2d 554 (1968)). Furthermore, in *Carafas*, this Honorable Court

> held that where the petitioner was in custody at the time the petition was filed, his release from prison before the petition for certiorari was filed did not moot the case because petitioner could still suffer 'serious disabilities because of the law's complexities and not because of his fault, if his claim that he has been illegally convicted is meritorious.'

Smith v. Ashcroft, 295 F.3d at 428 (*quoting Carafas v. LaVallee*, 391 U.S. at 239). The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, basing it's decision on *Carafas*, held that it had jurisdiction to hear petitioner's habeas corpus claim (brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254) to challenge the reinstatement of a prior removal order under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) of removing him without a hearing. *Smith v. Ashcroft*, 295 F.3d 425 at 427, 428. The petitioner had challenged the reinstatement of his prior removal order by filing the habeas petition with the district court, which later dismissed without elaboration. *Id.*

In the case at bar, Petitioner originally had filed a Complaint for Mandamus, Declaratory Judgment, and Injunction in the district court, which was ultimately dismissed for lack of jurisdiction on August 8, 2001. (App. 21a). Moreover, on August 14, 2001, Petitioner petitioned the district court for leave to file a First Amended Complaint adding a habeas corpus claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, which was ultimately denied as "futile" on September 7, 2001. (App. 5a, *See also* R14). The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit affirmed the district court's dismissal of the case, and did not remand the case to the district court to hear the Petitioner's petition for habeas corpus, even though Petitioner was in custody at the time of the petition. This is an erroneous conclusion since under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, the district courts do have jurisdiction to hear habeas corpus petitions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Furthermore, the conclusion of the court of appeals affirming the dismissal, and the conclusion of the district court denying the habeas corpus claim as "futile," is antagonistic to this Honorable Court's holding in *Carafas* and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals' reasoning in *Smith v. Ashcroft*, *supra*.

II. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS' CONCLUSION THAT PETITIONER'S REMOVAL WITHOUT A HEARING DOES NOT VIOLATE HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH AMENDMENT IS CONTRARY TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS' POSITION

This Honorable Court in *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 121 S.Ct. 2491 (2001), when discussing the post-removal-period detention statute (8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6)), stated that the Constitution may well preclude granting "an administrative body the unreviewable authority to make determinations implicating fundamental rights." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 692 (*citing Superintendent, Mass. Correctional Inst. At Walpole v. Hill*, 472 U.S. 445, 450, 105 S.Ct. 2768 (1985) (O'Connor, J.)). Once an alien enters the country, the legal circumstance changes, because the Due Process Clause applies to *all persons* within the United States, *including aliens*, whether their presence is lawful, *unlawful*, temporary, or permanent. *Id.* at 693 (*citing Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202, 210, 102 S.Ct. 2382, 72 L.Ed.2d 786 (1982) (emphasis added); *Mathews v. Diaz*, 426 U.S. 67, 77, 96 S.Ct. 1883, 48 L.Ed.2d 478 (1976); *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 596-598, and n.5, 73 S.Ct. 472, 97 L.Ed.2d 576 (1953); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 369, 6 S.Ct. 1064, 30 L.Ed. 220 (1886)). It is well established that the Fifth Amendment entitles aliens to due process of law in deportation proceedings. *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 307, 113 S.Ct. 1439, 123 L.Ed.2d 1 (1993). Moreover, the majority in *Zadvydas* noted that "[a]liens who have once passed through our gates, even *illegally*, may be expelled *only* after proceedings conforming to traditional standards of fairness encompassed in due process of law." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at

693 (*quoting Shaughnessy v. U.S. ex rel. Mezei*, 345 U.S. 206 at 212, 73 S.Ct. 625, 97 L.Ed. 956 (1953) (emphasis added).

Cases holding that because Congress has "plenary power" to create immigration law, the Judicial Branch must defer to Executive and Legislative Branch decision-making in that area, did not help the Government's position (of the constitutionality of the indefinite detention statute) since that power is subject to important constitutional limits. *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 695 (*citing INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 941-942, 103 S.Ct. 2764, 77 L.Ed.2d 317 (1983); *The Chinese Exclusion Case*, 130 U.S. 581, 604, 9 S.Ct. 623, 32 L.Ed. 1068 (1889).

In *Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 65 S.Ct. 1443, 89 L.Ed. 2103 (1945), this Court discussed the seriousness of deportation while deciding that the detention of a Communist Party affiliator was unlawful as contemplated under § 23 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 673, 8 U.S.C. § 137. *See*, *Bridges*, 65 S.Ct. 1443 (1945). Specifically, this Court stated that " . . . it must be remembered that although deportation technically is not criminal punishment, it may nevertheless visit as great a hardship as the deprivation of the right to pursue a vocation or a calling." *Id.* at 1449 (*citing Johannessen v. U.S.*, 225 U.S. 227, 242, 32 S.Ct. 613, 617, 56 L.Ed. 1066 (1912); *Bugajewitz v. Adams*, 228 U.S. 585, 591, 33 S.Ct. 607, 608, 57 L.Ed. 978 (1913); *Mahler v. Eby*, 264 U.S. 32, 39, 44 S.Ct. 283, 286, 68 L.Ed. 549 (1924). The majority opinion reiterated Mr. Justice Brandeis' comment in *Ng Fung Ho v. White*, 259 U.S. 276, 284, 42 S.Ct. 492, 495, 66 L.Ed. 938 (1922), that deportation may result in the loss "of all that makes life worth living." *Bridges*, 65 S.Ct. at 1449. In Justice Murphy's concurrence, a discussion of the alien's

proceeding (and the constitutionality of 8 U.S.C. § 137) resulted in the following:

> When the immutable freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights have been so openly and concededly ignored, the full wrath of constitutional condemnation descends upon the action taken by the Government. And only by expressing that wrath can we give form and substance to the 'great, the indispensable democratic freedoms'. . . . The unconstitutionality of the statute in issue and the invalidity of the proceeding brought pursuant thereto are obvious. As construed and applied in this case, the statute calls for the deportation of [the alien] after a fair hearing in which 'some' evidence is established that he was a member or affiliate of an organization advocating the forceful overthrow of the Government. Such a provision rests its claim to legality upon one basic assumption . . . that the 'plenary' power of Congress to deport resident aliens is unaffected by the guarantee of substantive freedoms contained in the Bill of Rights. . . . From this premise it follows that Congress may constitutionally deport aliens for whatever reasons it may choose, *limited only by the due process requirement of a fair hearing*. . . . I am unable to believe that the Constitution sanctions that assumption or the consequences that logically and inevitably flow from its application.

Bridges, 65 S.Ct. at 1455 (emphasis added).

In *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 70 S.Ct. 445, 94 L.Ed. 616 (1950), this Honorable Court, in holding that administrative hearings in deportation cases must conform to requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (hereinafter "APA") of June 11, 1946, addressed the Government's

position that there is no requirement for any hearing or adjudication in the statute authorizing deportation (8 U.S.C. § 155(a)) and that such an omission shields the proceedings from the APA. *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33, 70 S.Ct. 445, 453, 94 L.Ed. 616 (1950). This Honorable Court rejected the Government's position by stating that "[a]ny argument premised on the proposition that the deportation statute does not require a hearing is that, without such hearing, there would be no constitutional authority for deportation." *Id.* at 454. The constitutional requirement of due process of law originates from the same source as Congress' power to legislate. *Id.* "It was under compulsion of the Constitution that this Court long ago held that an antecedent deportation statute must provide a hearing at least for aliens who had not entered clandestinely and who had been here some time *even if illegally*." *Id.* (emphasis added). Furthermore, this Honorable Court enunciated that it would hardly attribute to Congress a purpose to be less scrupulous about the fairness of a hearing necessitated by the Constitution than one granted by the Constitution as a matter of expediency. *Id.* Lastly, "[w]hen the Constitution requires a hearing, it requires a fair one, one before a tribunal which meets at least currently prevailing standards of impartiality," and that a deportation hearing involves issues basic to human liberty and happiness and perhaps to life itself. *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33, 70 S.Ct. 445, 94 L.Ed. 616 (1950).

Factually similar to the case at bar, *Yamataya v. Fisher*, 189 U.S. 86, 23 S.Ct. 611, 47 L.Ed. 721 (1903) (the "Japanese Immigrant Case") presented a Japanese alien inspected by an immigration inspector who determined that the alien arrived in violation of the law. *Yamataya*, 23 S.Ct. at 611. After it was found that the alien was immediately

deportable without a hearing pursuant to the Act of March 3d, 1891 (26 Stat. at L. 1085, chap. 551, U.S. Comp. Stat. 1901), this Honorable Court stated that it had never held that administrative officers, when executing the provisions of a statute involving the liberty of persons, can disregard the fundamental principles that inhere in due process of law; one of these principles is that no person shall be deprived of his liberty without opportunity to be heard, before administrative officers, in respect of the matters upon which that liberty depends. *Id.* This Honorable Court held that it was not competent for any executive officer, at any time within the year limited by the statute, to arbitrarily cause an alien who had entered the country and had become subject to its jurisdiction and a part of its population, although alleged to be illegally here, to be taken into custody and deported without giving him all opportunity to be heard upon the questions involving his right to be and remain in the country. *Id.* at 614-615.

A. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals Holds That Removal Without A Hearing Does Not Violate Petitioner's Fifth Amendment Right To Due Process

The court of appeals agreed with the Petitioner that he was correct in asserting that illegal aliens are "persons" within the meaning of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clauses. (App. 7a). However, the court decided to look into the Petitioner's claim only to the extent of whether the reinstatement order was properly entered. (App. 8a). Specifically, the court mentioned the minimization of jurisdiction: "We agree with other circuits that have considered the question that our jurisdiction in such an instance extends only to the question whether the

reinstatement order was properly entered; we cannot look beyond that order . . . " (App. 8a). Thus, irrespective of the Petitioner's right to a full and fair hearing, the court of appeals decided to merely analyze the reinstatement procedure. And, by minimizing the due process evaluation, the court of appeals ignored the precedent of such cases as *Reno v. Flores* (entitlement to due process of law in deportation proceeding), *Zadvydas* (proceedings to conform with traditional standards of fairness encompassed in due process of law), *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath* (deportation statute must provide a hearing at least for aliens who had not entered clandestinely and who had been here some time, even if illegally), as noted *supra*.

Furthermore, the court of appeals attempted to weigh the interests of the Petitioner against those of the Government. (App. 8a-9a). It stated that the Government had a "compelling" and "strong federal" interest in the efficient administration of immigration laws and removal of "foreigners" who have no right to be here. (App. 8a). Against such a weighty governmental interest was Petitioner's liberty interest in remaining in the country, which was dismissed by the court of appeals since Petitioner "c[ould] have no liberty interest in remaining in violation of applicable United States law." (App. 8a). The court of appeals, however, did not stop at the point of dismissing Petitioner's liberty interest; it further stated that the reinstatement process by an immigration inspector is to be measured by whether the official abided by the Constitution. (App. 9a). Without directly addressing the issue, it is assumed that the court of appeals found that the removal procedure without a hearing did not violate the Petitioner's due process rights. (App. 9a-10a). Hence, the court of appeals minimized the due process evaluation to the

reinstatement procedure itself, and did not take into account the full amount of Petitioner's due process rights as contemplated in *Reno v. Flores*, *Zadvydas*, *Wong Yang Sung*, and *Yamataya*, discussed *supra*.

Lastly, the court of appeals did not fully address the constitutional ramifications of the Petitioner's adjudication by immigration officers. That is, in both the initial removal order and the reinstatement order, Petitioner was quickly disposed of, albeit semi-judicially, by immigration officers – not an immigration judge or any other judicial entity. Although the court of appeals limited the due process analysis to the reinstatement procedure itself (*See* App. 8a), attention to the Petitioner's specific scenario of immigration officers adjudicating his removal and reinstatement may have triggered due process violations.

B. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' Position On the Reinstatement Process

The Ninth Circuit has held that it is well established that the Due Process Clause applies to protect immigrants in deportation proceedings, and moreover that due process for an immigrant threatened with deportation includes the right to a full and fair hearing. *Getachew v. INS*, 25 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 1994) (*citing Landon v. Plasencia*, 459 U.S. 21, 103 S.Ct. 321, 74 L.Ed.2d 21 (1982); *Castillo-Villagra v. INS*, 972 F.2d 1017, 1028 (9th Cir. 1992)). Furthermore, the "fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." *Id.* (*quoting Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333, 47 L.Ed.2d 18, 96 S.Ct. 893 (1976). In *Castro-Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 2001), the court stated that "we seriously doubt that the government's new

reinstatement procedure [the use of Immigration Officers to determine whether to reinstate removal orders] comports with the Due Process Clause." *Castro-Cortez v. INS*, 239 F.3d 1037, 1040 (9th Cir. 2001). Although the court did not need to decide the question of whether the reinstatement procedure comports with the Due Process Clause, it did provide an elaborate discussion on 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5):

> Not only are aliens subject to reinstatement denied the opportunity to appear before an impartial decision-maker, but the regulations do not provide them with access to counsel. . . . Denial of th[e] right [to place information into the administrative record] not only jeopardizes the chances for a fair determination initially, but it hampers our review of the INS decision. The INA precludes us from considering facts not in the administrative record, INA § 242(b)(4), and it also prohibits us from rendering this matter to the district court for fact-finding. INA § 242(a)(1). . . . The contention that this procedure comports with fundamental notions of due process is difficult for us to comprehend.

Castro-Cortez, 239 F.3d at 1049-1050.

It should be noted that in a subsequent case, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, although rejecting a challenge by an alien who collaterally attacked his reinstated deportation order on the basis that the reinstatement statute and regulations violated due process, upheld the Attorney General's reinstatement because that alien *had a hearing prior to his deportation*. *Alvarenga-Villalobos v. Ashcroft*, 271 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 2001) (emphasis supplied). Because that alien did have a prior hearing, the court reasoned that "preclud[ing] a second

bite at the apple after illegal reentry does not offend due process." *Id.* at 1174. However, the situation in the case at bar is in contrast to *Alvarenga* since the Petitioner here has *never* had any type of hearing. Petitioner's adjudication was merely performed by immigration officers. *See generally* (App. 2a-3a).

From the foregoing, it is clear that the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals' conclusion of the validity of the reinstatement process is at odds with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' determination that the reinstatement process most likely does not comport with due process. *See Castro-Cortez*, 239 F.3d at 1049-1050. In addition, the absence of any hearing in the Petitioner's scenario is not comparable to the situation in *Alvarenga*; since Petitioner has never been granted a hearing, this is not a situation where the Petitioner is precluded from "a second bite at the apple after illegal reentry," thereby not offending due process. *See Alvarenga*, 271 F.3d at 1174. Hence, Petitioner's reinstatement procedure may have offended due process.

CONCLUSION

THEREFORE, Petitioner RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ requests this Honorable Court to GRANT his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Respectfully Submitted,

TAHER KAMELI, ESQ.
LAW OFFICES OF KAMELI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
220 South State Street
Suite 2026
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-4529

Attorney for Petitioner

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

BRIAN PERRYMAN, District Director,
and the
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondents.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Seventh Circuit

APPENDIX

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

Nos. 01-3068, 01-3454

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,
Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

BRIAN PERRYMAN, DISTRICT DIRECTOR,

Defendant-Appellee,

and

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
No. 01-C-5768 – **Suzanne B. Conlon**, *Judge.*

Petition to Review Decision of the
Immigration and Naturalization Service.
File No. A 75 897-228.

Argued January 24, 2002 – Decided October 24, 2002

Before EASTERBROOK, RIPPLE, and DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judges.*

DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*. Ruben Gomez-Chavez entered the United States illegally some time after he had been summarily removed from the country and ordered not to return for a period of five years. When the INS learned that he was back, it reinstated the earlier order of removal, which then triggered an even more streamlined new removal process. After some procedural confusion, we granted a stay of the new order pending the result of this appeal. We now affirm the decision of the district court.

I

Gomez-Chavez, a Mexican national, was detained on January 30, 1999, while attempting to enter the United States unlawfully with a fraudulent passport. He was placed in expedited removal proceedings pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and charged with being inadmissible as a noncitizen. In a proceeding that very day before immigration inspector Ernesto Aguirre, Gomez-Chavez was asked a number of questions to determine his identity, citizenship, and admissibility. (Apparently this took place in English; Gomez-Chavez was assisted by neither an interpreter nor an attorney.) He admitted all pertinent facts, including his identity and the manner in which he had procured the fraudulent passport. Specifically, he confessed that he had purchased a birth certificate and social security card in the name of Carmelo Hernandez for $800. He then used the documents to obtain a passport. On this basis, the INS found him ineligible for admission to the United States and barred him from entering without the Attorney General's consent for a period of five years. The removal was conducted pursuant to § 1225(b)(1), which permits immigration officers to order aliens removed without further hearings or review unless the alien indicates an

intention to apply for asylum. Gomez-Chavez was deported on that day, January 30, 1999, without ever receiving a full-blown administrative hearing.

These proceedings did not make much of an impression on him, because less than a month after his removal, Gomez-Chavez reentered the United States. He did so even though he had signed documents warning him that an unauthorized reentry would put him at risk of a criminal prosecution, and subsequent sentence of two to twenty years in prison and fines up to $250,000. On March 5, 1999, he married Sonia Martinez, a United States citizen. Two months later, Martinez filed a Form I-30 with the INS seeking to classify Gomez-Chavez as an immediate family member. At the same time, Martinez and Gomez-Chavez also filed a form I-485 application to adjust Gomez-Chavez's status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence. Despite the existence of the January 30 removal order (about which it seemed to be unaware), on June 1, 1999, the INS issued an Employment Authorization Card to Gomez-Chavez and renewed the card twice, on April 20, 2000, and April 5, 2001.

On July 18, 2001, Gomez-Chavez and Martinez attended an interview conducted by the INS in conjunction with the application for adjustment of status. During the interview, the INS agent realized that Gomez-Chavez had reentered the country illegally. This led to the immediate reinstatement of the January 30 removal order, under the authority of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5), which reads as follows:

> If the Attorney General finds that an alien has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed . . . the prior order of removal is reinstated from its original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed, the alien is not

> eligible and may not apply for any relief under this chapter, and the alien shall be removed under the prior order at any time after the reentry.

Gomez-Chavez was released on July 19, 2001, and ordered to report back to the INS on August 2, 2001, for removal without a hearing pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 241.8. It was at that point that he began the proceedings that have brought the case before us now, which we conclude were ineffective to avoid the current removal order.

II

In order to clarify where this case presently stands, we must review its rather messy history from the time of the July 19, 2001, order of reinstatement forward. On July 25, 2001, Gomez-Chavez filed an I-212 application with the INS for permission to *reapply* for admission into the United States after removal. He also filed a complaint for mandamus and declaratory judgment in the district court. On August 8, 2001, the district court dismissed the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, on the ground that all challenges to removals belonged only in the court of appeals upon a timely petition for review. Gomez-Chavez then promptly filed a petition for review to this court, which was docketed on August 8, 2001, and assigned Case Number 01-3068. By order of August 9, 2001, we dismissed that appeal for lack of jurisdiction. When asked to clarify, we stated that the INS "decision dated July 18, 2001, constitutes a decision of the Attorney General to execute a removal order and therefore this court's jurisdiction is barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g)."

Gomez-Chavez then returned to the district court, asking it to reconsider its decision in light of this court's

ruling. At that time, he also filed a motion for leave to file a first amended complaint to add a habeas corpus claim. On August 21, 2001, the district court denied his motion to reconsider and on September 7, 2001, it denied his motion for leave to file a first amended complaint. This time, when Gomez-Chavez filed his notice of appeal, we granted a stay of his deportation pending the results of this appeal.

Although the district court was clearly correct to reject Gomez-Chavez's efforts to proceed by way of mandamus, declaratory judgment, and habeas corpus, it was also correct earlier when it told Gomez-Chavez that his challenge to the INS's removal order belonged in this court. What should have happened then, in Appeal No. 01-3068, is an examination of the arguments Gomez-Chavez was making to see if he was really challenging only the removal order, or if his appeal raised issues not covered by § 1252(g). Although the 1996 Amendments generally foreclosed judicial review of deportation orders by way of habeas corpus in the district court, in certain cases aliens may petition the court of appeals directly for review of INS removal determinations. *LaGuerre v. Reno,* 164 F.3d 1035, 1038-40 (7th Cir. 1998). This is true even if, as in Gomez-Chavez's case, there was never a hearing before an immigration judge or the district court. *Id.* Thus, Gomez-Chavez was entitled to petition this court for review of the July 19 order reinstating the order of removal. We think that the best way to remedy this problem is to recall the mandate in No. 01-3068, and re-open that appeal. With respect to the present appeal, No. 01-3454, we affirm the district court's judgment.

III

Although these steps bring the merits of Gomez-Chavez's appeal before us, we conclude that nothing he has presented entitles him to relief from the INS's order. Gomez-Chavez's primary claim is that the INS is now improperly refusing to adjudicate his I-212 application for waiver of inadmissibility. But this argument fits squarely within the steps covered by the prohibition on judicial review found in 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). Under § 1252(g), courts are barred from reviewing discretionary decisions to "commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders." *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 482 (1999); *Chapinski v. Ziglar,* 278 F.3d 718, 721 (7th Cir. 2002); *Singh v. Reno,* 182 F.3d 504, 508-09 (7th Cir. 1999). These strict limitations apply not only to the Attorney General's positive actions, but also to his refusals to take action. *Alvidres-Reyes v. Reno,* 180 F.3d 199, 205 (5th Cir. 1999). An alien attempting to achieve judicial review of such discretionary measures may not avoid the § 1252(g) bar by the simple expedient of recharacterizing a claim as one challenging a refusal to act. *Cardoso v. Reno,* 216 F.3d 512, 516 (5th Cir. 2000).

Although § 1252(g) bars Gomez-Chavez from obtaining an order commanding the INS to adjust his status or precluding his removal, this does not mean that the courts have ceased to exist for cases in which a true miscarriage of justice may be occurring. *LaGuerre v. Reno,* 164 F.3d at 1040. For example, the Supreme Court held in *INS v. St. Cyr,* 533 U.S. 289 (2001), that the district courts continue to have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to entertain habeas corpus petitions based on pure questions of law. Furthermore, the observation in this court's decision in *Yang v. INS,* 109 F.3d 1185 (7th Cir. 1997), remains true:

the review-preclusion provisions in the 1996 amendments to the immigration laws do not preclude the court of appeals from determining whether the alien is being removed for a permissible reason. Thus, the agency does not have the "final say on constitutional matters"; instead, that power rests with the courts. *Singh,* 182 F.3d at 510. Following this line of cases, Gomez-Chavez argues that the removal without a hearing violates his due process rights under the Fifth Amendment.

As a preliminary matter, we note that Gomez-Chavez is unquestionably correct when he asserts that aliens, even those illegally present in the United States, are "persons" within the meaning of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment due process clauses. See *Zadvydas v. Davis,* 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001) ("[A]liens who have once passed through our gates, even illegally, may be expelled only after proceedings conforming to traditional standards of fairness encompassed in due process of law.") (quoting *Shaughnessy v. Mezei,* 345 U.S. 206, 212 (1953)); *Plyler v. Doe,* 457 U.S. 202, 210 (1982) (rejecting argument that undocumented aliens, because of their immigration status, are not covered by the Fourteenth Amendment, and observing that "[w]hatever his status under the immigration laws, an alien is surely a 'person' in any ordinary sense of the term. Aliens, even aliens whose presence in this country is unlawful, have long been recognized as 'persons' guaranteed due process of law by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments."); *Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong,* 426 U.S. 88, 101-02 (1976) (striking down Civil Service Commission regulations excluding lawful resident aliens from most federal service, as a violation of the Fifth Amendment's due process clause); *Galvan v. Press,* 347 U.S. 522, 530-31 (1954) (upholding a statute requiring deportation of

aliens who had been members of the Communist Party, but reaffirming the proposition that "the Executive Branch of the Government must respect the procedural safeguards of due process" when it implements policies relating to aliens). The key question for almost all due process problems, however, is how much in the way of formalities is required in the particular situation before the court. See, *e.g., Mathews v. Eldridge,* 424 U.S. 319, 334-35 (1976).

Here, it is important to bear in mind that we are dealing with immigration policy, which has traditionally been the province of the political branches. The United States has a compelling interest in the efficient and evenhanded administration of the laws regulating the admission of foreigners to this country and, in cases where it becomes necessary, removal of anyone who had no right to be here, or who has forfeited that right by his or her conduct. Balanced against that strong federal interest is Gomez-Chavez's liberty interest in remaining in the United States and the probability of error. But he can have no liberty interest in remaining in violation of applicable United States law. Furthermore, it is important that in this case we are dealing with an order reinstating a prior order of removal. We agree with the other circuits that have considered the question that our jurisdiction in such an instance extends only to the question whether the reinstatement order was properly entered; we cannot look behind that order to the underlying removal order. See *Ojeda-Terrazas v. Ashcroft,* 290 F.3d 292, 295 (5th Cir. 2002) (adopting this rule and citing cases from other circuits).

A reinstatement procedure is quite limited in scope, and thus does not require elaborate procedures. The INS must determine only (1) the identity of the alien, (2)

whether she was subject to a prior removal order, and (3) the terms on which she left and reentered the country. Gomez-Chavez does not dispute that all three of these matters were ascertained, and ascertained accurately, at the July 18 proceeding. He argues instead that the reinstatement process is unconstitutional because the determinations are made not by judicial officials, but by administrative officials.

Gomez-Chavez has not, however, given a complete description of the process. True, it is an INS administrative official who determines whether the reinstatement criteria are met, but after the agency has acted, the alien is entitled to direct judicial review in the court of appeals. This is hardly an unusual pattern, even if the agency processes here were more truncated than many. Although we may not grant immigration inspectors the same fact-finding deference as we would immigration judges, there is a presumption that the immigration inspectors are not biased. *Marcello v. Bonds,* 349 U.S. 302, 313-14 (1955). In either case we look to see if the official abided by the agency rules as well as the Constitution. We need not decide what kind of procedures would have been necessary if, upon the INS official's apparent discovery of irregularities in Gomez-Chavez's situation, he had immediately challenged the accuracy of that determination (for example, by arguing that the official had the wrong person, or that the five-year time period had run, or that he had obtained the Attorney General's permission, etc.). If these points come up only on appeal, because of the summary nature of the initial proceeding, it may still not be too late to explore the facts. The Ninth Circuit has adopted a procedure, which the INS urges us to approve as well, under which a case with disputed facts may be transferred

to the district court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2347(b)(3) for a hearing. See *Gallo-Alvarez v. Ashcroft*, 266 F.3d 1123, 1129 (9th Cir. 2001).

This case is not the one in which we need to decide whether the method supported by the *Gallo-Alvarez* court is the best way to address problems with the reinstatement proceeding, or if other steps might be preferable. Here, no additional fact-finding is necessary, because there are simply no disputed facts that could make a difference for Gomez-Chavez. At argument Gomez-Chavez's counsel admitted that the sole reason for requesting a hearing at this time was to obtain a waiver under I-212 from the removal proceedings. If his I-212 application were approved, then Gomez-Chavez could have his I-485 application for adjustment of status renewed. But the INS was entitled to proceed on the basis of the earlier order and to avoid rewarding Gomez-Chavez for his illegal reentry (which it facilitated for a time by granting work permits, before it detected the problem). Gomez-Chavez remains removable despite his I-212 application.

IV

We note finally that the INS conceded at oral argument that one legitimate avenue remains for Gomez-Chavez. The Attorney General has the power, conferred by 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), to waive the statute's general prohibition upon readmission to the United States for aliens subject to an order of removal, if the person is the spouse or child of a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident alien, and if the refusal of admission "would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien." *Id.* The Attorney

General has sole and unreviewable discretion to grant any such waiver. Nonetheless, according to INS counsel, Gomez-Chavez would be able to apply for a waiver from a location outside the United States, and we have no way of knowing how the Attorney General might respond.

We therefore recall the mandate in our prior order in this matter, No. 01-3068, and reinstate that appeal. On the merits, we decline to disturb the INS order reinstating the removal order and requiring Gomez-Chavez's immediate departure from the United States. We also AFFIRM the district court's order in No. 01-3454 dismissing the complaint.

A true Copy:

Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court
of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

JUDGMENT – WITH ORAL ARGUMENT

Date: October 24, 2002

BEFORE: Honorable FRANK H. EASTERBROOK,
Circuit Judge

Honorable KENNETH F. RIPPLE,
Circuit Judge

Honorable DIANE P. WOOD, Circuit Judge

Nos. 01-3068 & 01-3454*

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,
Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

BRIAN PERRYMAN, District Director,
Defendant-Appellee,

and

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, No. 01 C 5768, Suzanne B. Conlon, Judge

and

---

* Appeal no. 01-3068 was submitted.

Petition for Review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals No. A-75-897-228

We therefore recall the mandate in our prior order in this matter, appeal no. 01-3068, and reinstate that appeal. On the merits, we decline to disturb the INS order reinstating the removal order and requiring Gomez-Chavez's immediate departure from the United States. We also AFFIRM, with costs, the district court's order in appeal no. 01-3454 dismissing the complaint. The above is in accordance with the decision of this court entered on this date.

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

November 18, 2002

Before

Hon. FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. KENNETH F. RIPPLE, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

Nos. 01-3068 & 01-3454

RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,
Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

BRIAN PERRYMAN,
District Director,
Defendant-Appellee,

and

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 01-C-5768

Suzanne B. Conlon,
Judge.

Petition to Review Decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

INS File No. A 75 897-228

ORDER

The opinion of this court issued on October 24, 2002, is amended to read as follows:

(1) Page 4, first full paragraph, line 12 to 13, "notice of appeal from that decision" is changed to "petition for review."

(2) Page 4, first full paragraph, line 15, "appeal" is changed to "petition."

(3) Page 5, first full paragraph, line 6, "Appeal" is changed to "Case."

(4) Page 5, first full paragraph, line 9, "appeal" is changed to "petition for review."

(5) Page 5, first full paragraph, line 21 to 22, "appeal" is changed to "petition."

(6) Page 5, first full paragraph under heading III, line 2, "appeal" is changed to "petition for review."

(7) Page 9, line 11 from the top, "on appeal" is changed to "in a petition for review."

(8) Page 10, second paragraph, line 2, "appeal" is changed to "petition for review."

SO ORDERED.

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Notice of Intent/Decision to Reinstate Prior Order

File No. A 75 897 228
Date July 18, 2001

Name: Ruben GOMEZ-Chavez

In accordance with section 241(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and 8 CFR 241.8, you are hereby notified that the Attorney General intends to reinstate the order of Removal (Deportation/exclusion/removal) entered against you. This intent is based on the following determinations:

1. You are an alien subject to a prior order of deportation/exclusion/removal entered on 01/30/99 at Dallas, Tx.
(Date) (Location)

2. You have been identified as an alien who:

☒ was removed on 01/30/99 (Date) pursuant to an order of deportation/exclusion/removal.

☐ departed voluntarily on _____ (Date) pursuant to an order of deportation/exclusion/removal on or after the date on which such order took effect (i.e., who self-deported).

3. You illegally reentered the United States on or about 2/23/99 at or near El Paso, TX.
(Date) (Location)

In accordance with Section 241(a)(5) of the Act, you are removable as an alien who has illegally reentered the United states after having been previously removed or departed voluntarily while under an order of exclusion,

deportation or removal and are therefore subject to removal by reinstatement of the prior order. You may contest this determination by making a written or oral statement to an immigration officer. You do not have a right to a hearing before an immigration judge.

The facts that formed the basis of this determination, and the existence of a right to make a written or oral statement contesting this determination, were communicated to the alien in the English *language.*

Deborah M. Walton, DO	/s/ Debora M. Walton
(Printed or typed name of official)	(Signature of officer)
	Deportation Officer
	(Title of officer)

Acknowledgment and Response

I ☒ do ☐ do not wish to make a statement contesting this determination.

7/18/02	/s/ Ruben Gomez
(Date)	(Signature of Alien)

Decision, Order and Officer's Certification

Having reviewed all available evidence, the administrative file and any statements made or submitted in rebuttal, I have determined that the above-named alien is subject to removal through reinstatement of the prior order, in accordance with section 241(a)(5) of the Act.

7-19-01	Chicago, Illinois	/s/ Deborah Achim
Date	(Location)	(Signature of authorized deciding INS official)
Deborah Achim		Assistant District Director/DRO
(Printed or typed name of official)		(Title)

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and
Naturalization Service

Notice: Order of Expedited Removal

DETERMINATION OF INADMISSIBILITY

File No: *A75 897 228*

Date: *01/30/1999*

In the Matter of: *GOMEZ-CHAVEZ, RUBEN*

Pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)), the Immigration and Naturalization Service has determined that you are inadmissible to the United States under section(s) 212(a) ☐ (6)(C)(i); ☒ (6)(C)(ii); ☐ (7)(A)(i)(I); ☐ (7)(A)(i)(II); ☐ (7)(B)(i)(I); and/or ☐ (7)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, as amended, and therefore are subject to removal, in that:

You are ineligible for admission to the United States because: On or about 1/30/99, you falsely represented yourself to be a citizen of the United States for the purpose or benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (including Section 274A) or any other Federal or State law, to wit: a U.S. passport in the name of Carmelo Hernandez which you obtained by fraud.

ERNESTO AGUIRRE
SENIOR IMMIGRATION INSP
Name and Title of Immigration Officer (Print)

/s/ Ernesto Aguirre, Sr.
Signature of Immigration Officer

ORDER OF REMOVAL
UNDER SECTION 235(b)(1) OF THE ACT

Based upon the determination set forth above and evidence presented during inspection or examination pursuant to section 235 of the Act, and by the authority contained in section 235(b)(1) of the Act, you are found to be inadmissible as charged and ordered removed from the United States.

/s/ Ernesto Aguirre Sr. Name and Title of Immigration Officer (Print)	/s/ Ernesto Aguirre Sr. Signature of Immigration Officer
/s/ G. Bevans A.P.D. Name and Title of Supervisor (Print)	_____ Signature of Supervisor, if available

☒ Check here if supervisory concurrence was obtained by telephone or other means (no supervisor on duty).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I personally served the original of this notice upon the above named person on 1-30-99 (Date).

/s/ Ernesto Aguirre Sr.
Signature of Immigration Officer

United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division

GOMEZ-CHAVEZ

v.

PERRYMAN

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Case Number: 01 C 5768

JUDGE CONLON

☐ Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury rendered its verdict.

■ Decision by Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that this case is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Michael W. Dobbins, Clerk of Court

Date: 8/8/2001

/s/ Sonya Banks [sbe]
Sonya Banks, Deputy Clerk

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

December 11, 2002

Before

Hon. FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, Circuit Judge

Hon. KENNETH F. RIPPLE, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

Nos. 01-3068 & 01-3454	] Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
RUBEN GOMEZ-CHAVEZ, *Plaintiff-Appellant, Petitioner,*	]
v.	]
BRIAN PERRYMAN, District Director, *Defendant-Appellee,*	] No. 01-C-5768
and	] Suzanne B. Conlon, Judge.
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,	] Petition to Review Decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.
Respondent.	] INS File No. A 75-897-228

ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed by the attorneys for Petitioner-Appellant on November 25, 2002, all members of the panel have voted to **DENY** rehearing.

TEXT OF RELEVANT PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND REGULATIONS

I. The relevant constitutional provisions involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

II. The relevant statutes involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i):

(b) Inspection of applicants for admission

(1) Inspection of aliens arriving in the United States and certain other aliens who have not been admitted or paroled

(A) Screening

(i) In general

If an immigration officer determines that an alien (other than an alien described in subparagraph (F)) who is arriving in

> the United States or is described in clause (iii) is inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(C) or 1182(a)(7) of this title, the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 1158 of this title or a fear of persecution.

8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5):

> If the Attorney General finds that an alien has reentered the United States illegally after having been removed or having departed voluntarily, under an order of removal, the prior order of removal is reinstated from its original date and is not subject to being reopened or reviewed, the alien is not eligible and may not apply for any relief under this act, and the alien shall be removed under the prior order at any time after the reentry.

8 U.S.C. § 1252(g):

> Except as provided in this section and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien under this chapter.

28 U.S.C. § 1331:

> The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

28 U.S.C. § 1361:

> The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the Plaintiff.

III. The relevant regulations involved in the case, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 14(1)(f), include:

8 C.F.R. § 241.8(a), (b), and (c):

> (a) Applicability. An alien who illegally reenters the United States after having been removed, or departed voluntarily, while under an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal shall be removed from the United States by reinstating the prior order. The alien has no right to a hearing before an immigration judge in such circumstances. In establishing whether an alien is subject to this section, the immigration officer shall determine the following:
>
> > (1) Whether the alien has been subject to a prior order of removal. The immigration officer must obtain the prior order of exclusion, deportation, or removal relating to the alien.
> >
> > (2) The identity of the alien, i.e., whether the alien is in fact an alien who was previously removed, or who departed voluntarily while under an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal. In disputed cases, verification of identity shall be accomplished by a

comparison of fingerprints between those of the previously excluded, deported, or removed alien contained in Service records and those of the subject alien. In the absence of fingerprints in a disputed case the alien shall not be removed pursuant to this paragraph.

(3) Whether the alien unlawfully reentered the United States. In making this determination, the officer shall consider all relevant evidence, including statements made by the alien and any evidence in the alien's possession. The immigration officer shall attempt to verify an alien's claim, if any, that he or she was lawfully admitted, which shall include a check of Service data systems available to the officer.

(b) Notice. If an officer determines that an alien is subject to removal under this Section, he or she shall provide the alien with written notice of his or her determination. The officer shall advise the alien that he or she may make a written or oral statement contesting the determination. If the alien wishes to make such a statement, the officer shall allow the alien to do so and shall consider whether the alien's statement warrants reconsideration of the determination.

(c) Order. If the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section are met, the alien shall be removed under the previous order of exclusion, deportation, or removal in accordance with section 241(a)(5) of the Act.